

MINUTES
SAN DIEGO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting – December 18, 2009
DPLU Hearing Room, 9:00 a.m.

The meeting convened at 9:07 a.m., recessed at 10:36 a.m., reconvened at 11:03 a.m., recessed at 12:37 p.m., reconvened at 1:37 p.m. and adjourned at 3:31 p.m.

A. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Beck, Brooks, Day (out at 12:37 p.m.), Norby, Pallinger, Riess, Woods

Commissioners Absent: None

Advisors Present: Areigat, Goralka, Lantis, Sinsay (DPW); Mehnert (OCC)

Staff Present: Aquino, Brown, Hingtgen, Rowan, Raya, Grunow, Giffen, Baca, Murphy, Farace, Gibson, Bennett, Hughes, Powers, Jones (recording secretary)

B. Statement of Planning Commission's Proceedings, Approval of Minutes for the Meeting of November 6, November 13 and November 20, 2009.

Action: Beck - Riess

Approve the Minutes of November 6, November 13 and November 20, 2009, with corrections to the Minutes of November 13 to reflect Staff's confirmation that there will be a mitigation agreement between Fish & Wildlife Service and County of San Diego representatives to establish the banks.

Ayes: 6 - Beck, Brooks, Norby, Pallinger, Riess, Woods
Noes: 0 - None
Abstain: 0 - None
Absent: 1 - Day

C. Public Communication: Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Commission on any subject matter within the Commission's jurisdiction but not an item on today's Agenda.

There was none.

Administrative:

- D. Announcement of Handout Materials Related to Today's Agenda Items**
- E. Requests for Continuance: Item 6**
- F. Formation of Consent Calendar: Items 6 (continuance), 7 and 9**

Public Road Standards, Agenda Item 1:

1. Public Road Standards, Countywide (continued from October 23, 2009)

The proposed project is the adoption of revisions to the San Diego County Public Road Standards. These standards establish design and construction requirements for public roads located within the unincorporated area of San Diego County. These standards apply to County-initiated public road improvement projects as well as privately-initiated public road improvement projects. Improvements to public roads are often required as conditions of land development (discretionary permit) approval. A draft companion document "Flexibility in County Road Design" has also been prepared to assist in implementation of the public road standards.

Staff Presentation: Goralka (DPW)

Proponents: ; **Opponents:**

Discussion:

Staff reviews the proposed public road standards and flexibility guidelines, as formulated by Staff, Planning Commission subcommittee members and interested parties. Staff is also assist the Valley Center community in the development of their own community road standards, much like those for the community of Fallbrook.

Commissioner Norby concurs with the comments submitted by the Sweetwater Planning Group regarding recognizing that formulating the road standard recommendations and the flexibility guidelines as an opportunity to preserve and enhance community character while also improving mobility.

The majority of today's audience members support Staff's recommendations and commend all those who participated in the subcommittee workshops or provided input to the subcommittee of Staff. Other audience members believe the proposals could be improved by including methods in which traffic circulation could reduce greenhouse gasses. They remind the Planning Commission that road standards must match the terrain of the various communities. Still others seek assurance that road widths of at least 36 feet curb-to-curb can be required for subdivisions.

Public Road Standards, Agenda Item 1:

Action: Brooks – Riess

Recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt Staff's proposed public road standards and the flexibility guidelines. Section 1.3 (Exceptions) is to include "equestrian" road users, and Section 9 (also Exceptions) is to include impacts to cultural resources as one of the factors, in addition to the environment.

Discussion of the Action:

Commissioner Beck questions whether the proposed road standards are compatible with the General Plan Update and is informed that they are. Staff also discusses concerns that have been raised about the need for onstreet parking requirements, noting that this issue would probably best be addressed in the Community Plans.

Ayes:	7 -	Beck, Brooks, Day, Norby, Pallinger, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

Commissioner Brooks commends all who participated in the road standards subcommittee workshops and provided input on these recommendations.

TM 4713RPL⁶R, Agenda Item 2:**2. Peppertree Park, Tentative Map (TM) 4713RPL⁶R, Fallbrook Community Plan Area (continued from December 4, 2009)**

A Revised Map (TM 4713RPL⁶ R) pertaining to Units 7 through 10 of the Peppertree Park Specific Plan was approved in November 2007. This Revised Map changed the alignment of Pepper Tree Lane through the northern portion of the project site, as well as the design of the 48 remaining residential lots in Units 7 and 8 of the Specific Plan area (267 residential lots total). The applicant now proposes to amend two conditions of the Resolution for TM 4713RPL⁶R as follows: (1) change Condition C.2.b to require a temporary 40' wide road improvement on a portion of Pepper Tree Lane with approved base material only, rather than an interim improvement consisting of asphaltic concrete pavement (without final lift) over an approved base with AC dike and walkway at 20' from centerline (DPLU supports); and (2) delete Condition C.2.c(3) and move it to C.2.d(4) so that the requirement to post bond/security for Pepper Tree Lane improvements (bridge construction) is moved from Unit 8 to Unit 9 or 10 (DPLU does not support). The project site is located at the northern portion of the Peppertree Park Specific Plan Area approximately 640 feet east of South Mission Road in the Fallbrook Community Plan Area. The General Plan Designation on the site is (21) Specific Plan Area, and the zoning is RS1.17 Residential and S88 Specific Planning Area Use Regulations.

Staff Presentation: Hingtgen

Proponents: 5; **Opponents:** 1

Discussion:

Staff explains that the security requirement is currently tied to Unit 8, per the applicant's request almost two years ago. The applicant now wishes to delay completion of the improvements until construction commences on Unit 9 or 10, though he has been aware since 1991 that Pepper Tree Lane would need to be improved. Staff informs the Planning Commission that there is currently no bond or guarantee from the applicant that the Pepper Tree Lane/Ostrich Farms Creek Bridge will ever be constructed.

TM 4713RPL⁶R, Agenda Item 2:

The applicant's representative maintains that the applicant always wanted to provide the improvements to Pepper Tree Lane during construction of Units 9 and 10, and informs the Planning Commission that each unit constructed was done so without a bond. The applicant believes the bond should be required when construction of the bridge is imminent, and informs the Planning Commission that Unit 6 was the first energy-efficient major development in the country.

Commissioner Day notes that project density is based on the updated General Plan, which hasn't been adopted yet. Staff clarifies that this project was presented to DPLU several years ago. At that time, the applicant proposed realignment of the bridge crossing and an increase in density via a separate General Plan Amendment application to help subsidize the cost of constructing the bridge. The last revised Map officially adopted the realigned bridge, and the General Plan Amendment has not moved forward since scoping in 2003. Staff reminds the Planning Commission that today's proposal is an amendment of the TM Resolution of Approval, and reiterates that the applicant is attempting to secure financing for Unit 7 by using Unit 8 as collateral. The applicant is required to provide specific public improvements at specific times; he has not done so, and continues to postpone his obligations. Staff insists that the bridge is necessary, and needed for onsite and local circulation. Staff also clarifies that Pepper Tree Lane is a Circulation Element road, and a revised Map without the bridge is not an option. Staff notes that the applicant was exempted from payment of TIF Ordinance fees because the project was determined to have fully analyzed and mitigated its cumulative traffic impact through future construction of the onsite portion of Pepper Tree Lane and other offsite improvements.

Concerns are voiced by a neighboring property owner that the project lacks a secondary access to Pepper Tree Park, which he believes must be provided by completion of Unit 7. There is also concern that the proposed gate will create longer emergency response times.

Commissioner Beck states he cannot support amending the General Plan to assist the applicant in obtaining financial support to meet his obligations. He finds the applicant's proposal that he be allowed to increase density as a means of funding the costs of the required improvements unacceptable. Commissioner Beck notes that approval of the applicant's separate request for a General Plan Amendment would allow approximately 100 additional residential units.

TM 4713RPL⁶R, Agenda Item 2:

Commissioners Day and Pallinger recommend that the exemption from TIF Ordinance fees be reconsidered and that the fees be reinstituted to fund Units 7 and 8, but Staff explains this can only be done by the Board of Supervisors. Commissioner Riess recommends requiring the applicant to post a bond for 35% of the cost of bridge construction today, increase that amount to 50% when construction of Unit 7 commences, increase it to 75% when construction of Unit 8 begins, and increase it to 100% when construction of Unit 9 begins. County Counsel points out that phased security isn't legal under the Subdivision Map Act. Commissioners Riess and Day also support formation of a bond assessment district as another option for obtaining funding for construction of the bridge.

Action: Day - Beck

Continue consideration of the Peppertree Park Tentative Map, TM 4713RPL⁶R, to the meeting of January 22, 2010, to allow Staff to review some of the alternatives discussed today, including reinstitution of the TIF Ordinance fees.

Vote: 3 - Beck, Day, Pallinger
Noes: 4 - Brooks, Norby, Riess, Woods
Abstain: 0 - None
Absent: 0 - None

The Motion fails.

Action: Riess - Beck

1. Adopt the Final Notice of Action approving Amendment 2 to the Resolution of Conditional Approval for Tentative Map 4713RPL⁶RA, which amends Conditions C.2.b and C.6.b, and makes the appropriate Findings and includes those requirements and conditions necessary to ensure that the project is implemented in a manner consistent with the Subdivision Ordinance and State law; and
2. Deny that portion of the application to remove Condition C.2.c(3) and replace it with Condition C.2.d(4) of the Resolution for Revised Map 4713RPL⁶R.

Vote: 6 - Beck, Brooks, Norby, Pallinger, Riess, Woods
Noes: 1 - Day
Abstain: 0 - None
Absent: 0 - None

P85-079W⁵, Agenda Item 3:**3. Oak Creek RV Park, Major Use Permit P85-079W⁵, Lakeside Community Plan Area (continued from December 4, 2009)**

On August 14, 2009, the Commission directed the applicant to consider a revision to the project to include a maximum time limit for the RV spaces proposed for long-term occupancy. Specifically, the Planning Commission identified that long-term occupancy should be defined as more than 90 days per calendar year but less than permanent (i.e. without a time limitation). On October 23, 2009, the Director of DPLU requested and was granted a continuance by the Commission so the applicant could work with the Cajon Valley School District to determine if any development fees were required following approval of the Modification. A letter stating that the Oak Creek RV Park would be exempt was subsequently received from the Cajon Valley School District.

The applicant requests that the Planning Commission grant approval of the P85-079W⁵ with the provision that 80% of the individuals occupying RV spaces in the park would have no occupancy limitation, and 20% of the individuals occupying RV spaces have a 90-day occupancy limitation within a twelve month period. Additionally, the applicant requests that the Commission grant approval of the Time Extension for P 85-079W⁴.

Staff Presentation: Brown

Proponents: 1; **Opponents:** 1

Discussion:

Concerns raised by the Planning Commission at their December 4, 2009 meeting centered around how the Conditions of Approval for this Major Use Permit Modification would be enforced, how Staff would ensure the spaces designated for short-term occupancy would remain so, and how it was determined that 25% of the total spaces is adequate. The Planning Commission also sought information regarding whether the Use Permit Findings allow denial of exemptions, and whether school fees are being paid through property taxes.

P85-079W⁵, Agenda Item 3:

Staff explains that no school fees are required. Staff explains the methodology by which it was determined that 25% of the spaces would be adequate for tourism or short-term occupancy in this project, but clarifies that the percentage determination also factors in project location. With respect to enforcement, Staff explains that facilities are initially inspected when Use Permits are granted, and operators are required to maintain logs for Staff's inspection. Following that initial inspection, site inspections are performed when complaints are received.

Staff and Counsel explain that the County is required to grant a full exemption to the occupancy limitations unless there are impacts that can not be mitigated by granting a partial exemption. However, as an alternative to granting a partial exemption, the Planning Commission can impose conditions on special occupancy parks.

The applicant is accepting of Staff's proposed recommendations, though he is not confident that reserving 25% of the spaces for limited occupancy can be enforced under the Health and Safety Code. He requests that he be allowed to seek 100% unlimited occupancy if Phase 2 is not constructed. The applicant also informs the Planning Commission that he pays approximately \$12,000 in school fees every year since purchase of the property, and this amount will increase to \$17,000 per year if Phase 2 is completed.

A neighboring property owner voices opposition to the proposed Use Permit Modification as does Commissioner Norby, who remains concerned about health and safety of park and community residents. Commissioner Norby prefers a 50-50 split, with 50% of the spaces for unlimited occupancy, and 50% of the spaces for limited-stay occupancy.

Action: Day – Pallinger

Grant Major Use Permit Modification P85-079W⁵ as recommended by Staff, and make the Findings and impose the requirements and Conditions as set forth in the Form of Decision.

Ayes:	6 -	Beck, Brooks, Day, Pallinger, Riess, Woods
Noes:	1 -	Norby
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

POD 09-005, Agenda Item 4:

4. Proposed Subdivision Ordinance Amendment POD 09-005 (Title 8, Division 1 of the County Code), Countywide

Proposed Ordinance amending Title 8, Division 1 of the County Code relating to Subdivisions. The proposed amendments will clarify existing language, implement changes required by revisions to the California Subdivision Map Act, repeal unnecessary provisions that are preempted by State law and make substantive changes that will establish clearer standards for new subdivisions.

Staff Presentation: Steven

Proponents: 1; **Opponents:** 0

Discussion:

Staff explains that the proposed amendments are intended to clarify existing language and clean up the Subdivision Ordinance. The recommendations were sent to all interested parties and posted on the DPLU's website. The comments received resulted in a minor correction requiring that property owners be held responsible for minor road maintenance. The recommendations are consistent with the General Plan Update.

The Valle de Oro Community Planning Group members are unsupportive of Staff's recommendations, particularly with respect to Sections 81.401 (Design of Major Subdivisions) and 81.403 (Supplemental Improvements and Reimbursement Agreements). The Planning Group chairman reminds those in attendance that onsite wastewater treatment is required by the Department of Environmental Health. The Planning Group also believes requiring supplemental sewer improvements based on County projections for full build-out is growth inducing.

Action: Riess – Pallinger

Recommend that the Board of Supervisors find that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment, and adopt the Subdivision Ordinance (Title 8, Division 1 of the County Code).

POD 09-005, Agenda Item 4:

Discussion of the Action:

Commissioners Beck and Norby are unsupportive of the Motion. Commissioner Beck is particularly concerned about the proposed revisions to Sections 81.401 and 81.403, as discussed by the Valle de Oro Planning Group chairman. He recommends that the revisions to Section 81.403 include language clarifying that the increased capacity of extended sewer lines will not exceed the applicable capacity of the Community Plans, but County Counsel reminds those in attendance that the Planning Commission's and the Board of Supervisors' decisions on subdivisions ultimately determine sewer pipe size.

Ayes:	4 -	Brooks, Pallinger, Riess, Woods
Noes:	2 -	Beck, Norby
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	1 -	Day

POD 09-009, Agenda Item 5:

5. Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment, POD 09-009; Countywide (Steven)

Proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to amend the applicability of the ordinance, to add Emergency Shelters as an allowed use, make miscellaneous minor additions to the definitions, exceptions to height limitations, temporary use regulations and other miscellaneous regulations, and to make minor modifications and clarifications to various other regulations.

Staff Presentation: Steven

Proponents: 1; **Opponents:** 0

Discussion:

Staff explains the intent of the proposed revisions, which includes exempting the County from the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance during, immediately after and throughout recovery efforts of a declared emergency in an effort to respond to community needs. The proposed revisions would eliminate the need for various County Departments to process discretionary permits prior to providing certain services on vacant or developed parcels that are not currently allowed "by right". Compliance with CEQA would still be required. Establishing certain industrial zones where emergency shelters are an allowed civic use by right subject to the proposed restrictions will provide opportunities to meet the potential need of communities for shelters without requiring discretionary permits. This amendment will also bring the Zoning Ordinance into compliance with State law.

Staff believes amending the Temporary Use regulations to allow temporary outdoor sales for seasonal products and three-day sales of vehicles, boats or trailers on existing commercial or industrial properties, subject to certain restrictions, would provide opportunities for temporary retail uses that are not currently allowed in the Ordinance.

Staff also believes amending the Planned Development Area regulations to allow the Director of DPLU TO waive the requirement for a Major Use Permit on certain uses rather than the Planning Commission would provide applicants a faster decision rather than going to a public hearing. In addition, amending this Section to a waiver of the requirement for a Major Use Permit for development of one single-family dwelling on a parcel of five or more acres would allow significant savings in processing time and Permit fees. The proposed revisions also include minor modifications and clarifications to other regulations.

POD 09-009, Agenda Item 5:

The Valle de Oro Community Planning Group chairman disagrees with several of Staff's recommendations, specifically Sections 5804(c), 5804(d) (Limitation on Use and Construction); and 6814(i) (Exceptions to the Enclosure Matrix). The Planning Group does not support allowing the Director of DPLU unilateral power to waive any portion of the Planned Development Area regulations. They believe the public should be allowed to review and comment on any deviation from those regulations, and any decision should be appealable to the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors.

The Planning Group also believes the enclosure matrix exemption for recycling processing facilities implies that the use should be acceptable when operated unenclosed in zones that may be visually sensitive, such as M52, A70, A72 and C40. The Planning Group believes this exemption should not apply to these zones due to these zones due to the high probability that unenclosed operation will adversely impact neighboring businesses or residences.

Action: Brooks – Riess

Recommend that the Board of Supervisors find that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment, and adopt the ordinance amending the Zoning Ordinance to (1) amend the applicability of the Ordinance; (2) add emergency shelters as an allowed use; (3) make miscellaneous minor additions to the definitions, exceptions to height limitations, temporary use regulations and other miscellaneous regulations; and (4) make minor modifications and clarifications to various other regulations.

Ayes:	6 -	Beck, Brooks, Norby, Pallinger, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	1 -	Day

P70-212W², Agenda Item 6:**6. Champagne Lakes RV Resort Expansion, Major Use Permit P70-212W², Valley Center Community Plan Area**

Proposed Modification of an existing Major Use Permit for a Recreational Vehicle (RV) Park at 8310 Nelson Way in the Valley Center Community Plan Area. The entitlements previously granted consist of 135 recreational vehicle spaces with utility hookups, five mobilehome spaces, and other park ancillary structures. The Modification consists of rearranging and developing all 140 of the previously approved RV spaces and mobilehome spaces with full hookup capacity (septic, water, and electricity). Additionally, the applicant requests that 117 of the individuals occupying the RV spaces will have no occupancy limitation and the remaining 23 RV Spaces would have a 90-day occupancy limitation within a one-year period. The occupancy limitations imposed in Condition D.6 and Section 6456.d of the Zoning Ordinance would be modified. Section 18865.2 of California Health and Safety Code mandates that local jurisdictions that have imposed such time limitations for occupancy of spaces within a special occupancy park shall grant an exemption to those limitations depending upon substantial findings within Statute 18865.2. The project site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category Estate Development Area (EDA), Land Use Designation Estate Residential (17). The site is zoned A70 Limited Agriculture, with a "B" special area designator and a maximum density of 0.5 dwelling unit per acre.

Staff Presentation: Brown

Proponents: 0; **Opponents:** 1

The applicant has requested that consideration of this Major Use Permit Modification be postponed to await the Planning Commission's decision on Item 3 on today's Agenda.

Action: Riess - Pallinger

Continue consideration of Major Use Permit Modification P70-212W² to the meeting of January 8, 2010.

Ayes:	7 -	Beck, Brooks, Day, Norby, Pallinger, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

P01-009 and RP 01-001, Agenda Item 7:**7. Turvey Mining Report, Major Use Permit P01-009 and Reclamation Plan (RP) 01-001; Alpine Community Plan Area**

Proposed Major Use Permit and Reclamation Plan to authorize a surface mining operation on a 46.7-acre parcel located on Alpine Boulevard, east of the Alpine Boulevard/Dunbar Lane intersection in the Alpine Community Plan Area. This mining operation would produce approximately 191,000 cubic yards of decomposed granite. The mining activities (excavation) and subsequent site reclamation would result in the creation of three level areas (Pads 3, 4, and 5) that would be suitable for a future boxed tree nursery operation. Mining operations would be conducted using conventional earth moving equipment and would continue for approximately 10 years. Rock material would be excavated, screened, and transported from the site by truck for use in construction projects. The project site is subject to the 1.3 Estate Development Area (EDA) General Plan Regional Category, and is zoned A70 (Limited Agricultural).

Staff Presentation: Aquino

Proponents: 4; **Opponents:** 0

This Item is approved on consent.

Action: Riess – Pallinger

Grant Major Use Permit P01-009 and make the Findings and impose the requirements and Conditions as set forth in the Form of Decision; and

Approve Reclamation Plan RP 01-001, and make the Findings and impose the requirements and Conditions as set forth in the Form of Decision.

Ayes:	7 -	Beck, Brooks, Day, Norby, Pallinger, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

TM 5516, Agenda Item 8:**8. Ranchita Tentative Map (TM) 5516, North Mountain Subregional Plan Area**

Proposed Tentative Map to subdivide a 149.3 acre lot into 17 residential lots and one Archaeological Open space Easement. The project site is located on Montezuma Valley Road near Lease Road in the North Mountain Subregional Plan area. The site is subject to the Rural Development Area (RDA) Regional Land use Policy, the (18) Multiple Rural Use Designation, and is zoned A70, Limited Agriculture. The site contains an existing single family residence that will be retained. Primary and secondary access to the site will be provided by a private road connecting to Montezuma Valley Road. The project would be served by an on-site septic system and groundwater.

Staff Presentation: Hughes

Proponents: 4; **Opponents:** 0

Discussion:

Commissioner Beck compliments the applicant on the project, but voices concern all of the onsite habitat will be destroyed. He notes that Staff came up with an alternate design that would result in preservation of 40% of the property. Commissioner Beck is familiar with this 149.3-acre parcel, and finds it almost impossible to believe no sensitive species were found onsite. Staff acknowledges that the site does have the potential to support sensitive species, but none were ever discovered.

Action: Pallinger – Norby

Adopt the Resolution of approval for the Ranchita Tentative Map, TM 5516, and make the Findings and impose the requirements and Conditions necessary to ensure that the project is implemented consistent with State law and County regulations; and

Adopt the Mitigation Declaration dated June 18, 2009 and on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use.

Ayes:	5 -	Brooks, Norby, Pallinger, Riess, Woods
Noes:	1 -	Beck
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	1 -	Day

P08-016, Agenda Item 9:**9. City of Escondido Wireless Telecommunications Facility, Major Use Permit P08-016, North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Area**

Proposed Major Use Permit to authorize the construction and operation of an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility at 25453 Lake Wohlford Road; in the North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Area. The facility would include a total of 15 antennas, including 12 panel antennas, a microwave dish and two GPS antennas mounted on a 50' tall faux pine tree. The project would also include the construction of a new 12' X 16' X 13' tall prefabricated shelter to enclose the associated equipment cabinets and a diesel generator. The site contains an existing Ranger Station with associated parking and landscaping. The project would occupy 840 square feet of the 155 acre parcel. The project site is subject to the Rural Development Area (RDA) Regional Land Use Policy, the (22) Public/Semi-Public Lands Land Use Designation, and is zoned S92 (General Rural).

Staff Presentation: Chan

Proponents: 1; **Opponents:** 0

This Item is approved on consent.

Action: Riess - Pallinger

Grant Major Use Permit P08-016, and make the Findings and impose the requirements and Conditions as set forth in the Form of Decision.

Ayes:	7 -	Beck, Brooks, Day, Norby, Pallinger, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

GPA 07-007, R07-004,
TPM 21062 & AP 07-001,

Agenda Item 10:

10. Embly Minor Subdivision, General Plan Amendment (GPA) 07-007, Zone Reclassification 07-004, Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) 21062, Agricultural Preserve (AP) 07-001; North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Area

Proposed General Plan Amendment (GPA), Zone Reclassification, and Agricultural Preserve Boundary Reconfiguration associated with a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide a 9.79 acre parcel into four lots and a remainder parcel. The GPA would extend the existing Regional Category, (ECA) Environmentally Constrained Area, to cover the entire parcel, which contains a small area on the eastern boundary that is currently designated (EDA) Estate Development Area. The GPA would also change the land use designation from (20) Agriculture to (1) Residential. The Zone Reclassification would retain the A70 Limited Agriculture use regulation but would change the minimum lot size from 10 acres net to 1 acre net and change the allowed density from 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres to 1 dwelling unit per 1 acre. The Zone Reclassification would also remove the Agricultural Preserve designation. The Agricultural Preserve Boundary Reconfiguration would remove the Agricultural Preserve from the Embly property. The property is located at 3255 Summit Drive in the North County Metropolitan Subregional Planning area.

Staff Presentation: Powers

Proponents: 2; Opponents: 1

Discussion:

Following Staff's presentation, a neighboring property owner voices his concerns regarding slope erosion off of Summit Drive. He presents letters from additional property owners, all of whom believe the requested Zone Reclassification will result in additional flooding and slope erosion. DPW Staff has determined that the proposed project will actually decrease runoff flow, but will contact the neighboring property owners to address what appears to be an existing problem.

Woods: Please report back to the PC after your field visit. Understand that the project will minimize the problem, but the issue still needs to be looked at.

GPA 07-007, R07-004,
TPM 21062 & AP 07-001,

Agenda Item 10:

Action: Riess – Pallinger

Recommend that the Board of Supervisors:

1. Adopt the Resolution of Approval for proposed General Plan Amendment (GPA) 07-007;
2. Adopt the Form of Ordinance approving proposed Zone Reclassification R07-004;
3. Adopt the Resolution approving an Agricultural Preserve Boundary Reconfiguration to the Johnson Agricultural Preserve Number 18, AP 07-00; and
4. Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration dated March 23, 2009 on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use.

Ayes:	6 -	Beck, Brooks, Norby, Pallinger, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	1 -	Day

Administrative:

G. Report on actions of Planning Commission's Subcommittees:

No reports were provided.

H. Results from Board of Supervisor Hearing(s):

No reports were provided.

I. Designation of member to represent the Planning Commission at Board of Supervisors meeting(s):

None.

J. Discussion of correspondence received by the Planning Commission:

There was none.

K. Scheduled Meetings:

January 8, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
January 22, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
February 5, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
February 19, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
March 5, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
March 19, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
April 2, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
April 16, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
April 30, 2010	Planning Commission Workshop, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
May 14, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room

Administrative:

May 28, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
June 11, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
June 25, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
July 9, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
July 23, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
August 6, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
August 20, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
September 10, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
September 24, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
October 8, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
October 22, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
November 5, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
November 19, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
December 3, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
December 17, 2010	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room

There being no further business to be considered at this time, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 3:31 p.m. to 9:00 a.m. on January 8, 2010 in the DPLU Hearing Room, 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B, San Diego, California.